

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2100**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor : Randy J. Longsdorf	
Appln. No.: 10/719,163	
Filed : November 21, 2003	Group Art Unit: 2121
For : PROCESS DEVICE WITH SUPERVISORY OVERLAYER	Examiner: Sunray Chang
Docket No.: R11.12-0812	

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Sir:

Electronically Filed July 31, 2007

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 1, 2007. With this response, claims 1-51 are presented for reconsideration and favorable action.

Section 6 the Office Action notes a definition of the term “retrofit”. Further, the Office Action at Section 5 along with the fourth full paragraph on page 4 cites Eryurek ‘567 as showing the retrofit as set forth in the pending claims.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the section of Eryurek ‘567 cited in the Office Action refers to the replacement of a component that is about to fail. The component that is being monitored and replaced in Eryurek ‘567 is not part of the diagnostic circuitry as set forth in the Eryurek ‘567 reference. In contrast, the invention as set forth in the pending claims, is directed to a providing the desired safety Integrity Level by retrofitting, or adding onto, an “older system”.

Therefore, the claimed invention relates to retrofitting while the cited passages of Eryurek ‘567 relate to replacement of a part. Further still, the claimed invention is directed to retrofitting particular elements which are used to monitor operation of a component. In contrast, the cited

section of Eryurek '567 relates to directly monitoring the component. For example, Eryurek '567 does not show a device interface. Even when combined with the other cited references, Eryurek '567 does not show the invention as set forth in the pending claims. It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Additionally, the dependent claims include numerous elements which are not shown in the cited references. These include, for example, monitoring data on a data bus, adding a sensor which couples to the process device, controlling loop current based upon a safety failure, the use of a watch dog circuit in a SIL configuration, monitoring errors in data stored in memory, interpolating to correct data errors, an implementation in a feature module which couples to a sensor module, and others.

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Judson K. Champlin/
Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312